



**SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL
LOCAL COMMITTEE EPSOM & EWELL**

**PUBLIC & MEMBER QUESTIONS SUBMITTED
FOR 30 MARCH CANCELLED MEETING**

**Public Question 1 – Simon Philip, Chair - Epsom Training Grounds Management Board
Re: Speed Limit on Epsom Downs**

In view of two recent accidents which resulted in the death of the horses involved, would the Committee support a reduction in the speed limit of the roads on Epsom Downs from 40-30mph?

Officer Response:

Given the rural nature of the roads on Epsom Downs, it is very unlikely that reducing the speed limit from 40mph to 30mph using signs alone would make a significant difference to driver behaviour. To have a realistic expectation of driver compliance, we would need to consider traffic calming similar to the existing traffic calming in the 30mph section of Langley Vale Road.

To provide traffic calming over a wide area would be beyond the reach of the Local Committee's budgets. In any case even if funding were to be made available it would take 2 to 3 years to deliver a scheme. In the same timescale it is proposed to make it mandatory for new cars to be fitted with technology that enables the car to limit its own speed. This is an EU initiative that the UK government indicated would be adopted in the UK regardless of the outcome of Brexit.

What this means is that gradually all vehicles in the UK will automatically obey the speed limit, making traffic calming redundant, and meaning that any proposed change of speed limit could be implemented with confidence that vehicles would lower or raise their maximum speeds accordingly. In this context it is not recommended that Committee invests in expensive speed management measures at the present time.

**Member Question 2 – Cllr Neil Dallen
Re: Potholes Epsom High Street East**

In February the A24 Epsom High Street East (North carriageway) was closed for pot hole repairs. By early March the stretch of carriageway had numerous pot holes.

- a. How long are pot hole repairs expected to last?
- b. Is it worth wasting money on repairs that do not last?
- c. Can the contractor be called back to repair the road again free of charge?

Officer Response:

- a. Permanent Safety Defect repairs should last indefinitely. Under our term Highways maintenance contract all repairs are guaranteed for 2 years. During this 2 year period any failures would be repaired at the contractor's expense. During periods of high demand we do undertake temporary repairs, which are intended to last approximately 1 month until a permanent repair can be scheduled.

ITEM 1

- b. No.
- c. If the failure is within the 2-year guarantee period.

Specifically in relation to the eastbound carriageway of Epsom High Street, between Waterloo Road and East Street, we are aware that this section of road is in very poor condition. It is quite likely that when one Safety Defect is repaired, the adjacent area of carriageway subsequently fails.

As such this section of road is a high priority for resurfacing and is currently on the Horizon programme for resurfacing next Financial Year 2020-21, along with the southernmost section of East Street up to Hook Road. Please note that we are aware that SGN may need to return to this same area to undertake further repairs / replacement of their gas mains. We will need to coordinate with SGN to minimise the likelihood of any new surface being dug up shortly after it is laid.

Member Question 3 – Cllr Neil Dallen **Re: School Places**

Epsom Downs Primary School pupils are not being sent to their local secondary school (Beacon) even though it is their first choice but being sent to Therfield in Leatherhead, Epsom and Ewell High in West Ewell (and possibly other schools)

- a. What does this do to the forecasts for Epsom secondary schools which shows that they are full?
- b. Why is this happening?
- c. What are the statistics for Epsom Primary School children moving to secondary schools?
 - i. What percentage are being offered their nearest school?
 - ii. What percentage are being offered a school in the borough?
 - iii. What percentage are being offered a school outside the borough?
- d. How do SCC respond to the Climate Change impact of long car journeys to school as there is no realistic public transport available for these journeys?

Officer response:

- a. The education place planning team use a forecasting system called Edge. This provides forecasts based on births, pupil movement trends and planned housing. The forecasts are based on pupil movement trends. Therefore, the projections for places needed in Epsom and Ewell will include pupils from other boroughs in Surrey (Reigate and Banstead, Elmbridge) and London boroughs (Sutton, Kingston upon Thames).

We can look at the flow of pupils to see the percentage projected from further away. Therefore, we can assess impacts of additional places in other areas.

- b. The admissions team allocates places based on each school's admission criteria. Not all pupils at Epsom Downs Primary School select The Beacon as a preference school. Surrey County Council has a duty to provide sufficient school places, but this is based on reasonable distance rather than borough boundaries. The Education Place Planning team is continuing to assess whether additional places are needed in Epsom and Ewell, and Reigate and Banstead.
- c. 47 pupils at Epsom Downs Primary School applied for a secondary school place for September 2020.
 - i. 29 (62%) were offered a place at their nearest school. Of the 18 children who were not offered a place at their nearest school, 10 were offered a preference school and 8 were centrally allocated to Epsom and Ewell High.
 - ii. In the borough of the school 66% were allocated to a Reigate and Banstead Schools. 28% of pupils allocated to Epsom and Ewell schools.

iii. Outside the borough of the school 34% were allocated to Epsom and Ewell and Mole Valley schools, 72% of pupils allocated outside Epsom and Ewell schools.

Epsom Downs Primary School and The Beacon are in Reigate and Banstead. However, pupils attending Epsom Downs Primary School may live near to or in the Boroughs of Epsom and Ewell or Mole Valley District. Surrey County Council does not allocate places on the basis of borough boundaries.

31 pupils were allocated places at schools in the borough of Reigate and Banstead (24 first preference, 4 second preference, 2 third preference, 1 fourth preference)

13 were allocated places at schools in the borough of Epsom & Ewell (2 first preference, 2 second preference, 1 third preference, 8 centrally allocated)

3 pupils were allocated places at schools in district of Mole Valley (2 first preference and 1 second preference)

d. As can be seen from the permutations of school placements arising from one school in one year group, this is a complex question with an equally complex answer.

Ideally SCC would like pupils to attend a local school within a reasonable distance. Parental preference for schools does not fully support this. By making a preference parent(s) are able to take account of how a pupil would get to school should their preference be met. The preference system also allows parent(s) to not include local schools or schools that are less popular with parents for whatever reason. Often when local schools are not included in preferences this leads to allocations to other schools that were not a preference, known as central allocations. These are made to the nearest schools with places available.

From a place planning perspective expanding only popular schools would allow more parental satisfaction in getting a school place. This is not always possible due to a number of reasons including: site constraints; the location of the school to identified needs; geographical location; surplus places at other schools, etc. The mixed economy of academy and maintained schools also means that this may not be possible in some schools.

SCC would commend a reduction of travel to schools for environmental reasons although currently this seems not to be easily achieved with parents deciding to travel to a preferred school or not putting a local school. The latter may mean that some parents will have to make arrangements to travel to ensure their child attends an allocated school.

Member Question 4 – Cllr Neil Dallen

Re: Thames Water

A Thames Water lorry acting as a septic tank has been 'parked' in East Street since November last year causing considerable inconvenience.

- a. What are SCC doing to get it moved on?
- b. Why don't / can't SCC charge Thames Water for 'parking' in the road? (TfL I believe do charge!)

Officer response:

SCC's Streetworks Team are in ongoing discussions with Thames Water (TWU) about the problems with the sewer at this location. The Tanker needs to remain on site as an interim

ITEM 1

measure, currently pumping sewerage to prevent blockage/flooding which would otherwise affect 40 properties.

TWU have identified there is an issue with a sewer under the properties fronting East Street, in that it is blocked, apparently with concrete. The sewer is approximately 3m deep. The problem therefore is devising a suitable engineering solution to repair the sewer, given the buildings standing over the top of it and the limited access to the location, which is via an alleyway between the buildings.

There is currently no option to divert the waste into a sewer directly behind East Street as that is a private sewer and there is no legal agreement in place; that is if the falls in the respective sewers would even provide suitable mitigation. TWU have proposed a short-term solution; to bury a flexible pipe in the carriageway & link it via a manhole to an existing sewer, which would alleviate the need for the tanker. The long-term engineering proposal is currently to directionally drill from an excavation in East Street, under the buildings themselves to provide a new sewer, which would require a 3 – 4 metre deep excavation in East Street.

The SCC Traffic Signals Team has adjusted the existing signal timings to try and best mitigate the impact that the tanker is having, however there is only a one lane discharge from the traffic signals in East Street towards the High Street and one lane is still available on the far side. At the Streetwork's team request TWU have buried the flexi pipe linked to the tanker into the footway in order to minimise the impact to passing pedestrians.

This remains a challenging engineering problem, which will require careful planning and execution. Given the complex and unusual nature of this work TWU have put this through a tendering process with their Contractor supply chain and once this process is finished, confirmation can be provided on final plans and when they will be executed. Whilst the current Covid19 pandemic has had significant impact on traffic flows and the location of the tanker is currently therefore less problematic, the pandemic may also impact on TWU's ability to commence such a major activity.

We will update the Committee on this issue in due course.

Member Question 5 – Cllr Neil Dallen **Re: Exhaust emissions outside schools**

Most people now accept that there is a Climate Change emergency and Surrey are producing an action plan to do what they can to improve the situation.

Exhaust emissions are harmful to the climate and also increase air pollution which is bad for our health.

One small, inexpensive action is for SCC to arrange for signs to be displayed on the highway outside schools and at taxi ranks stating something like –
“To help with climate change and air pollution, drivers are requested to switch off their engines while waiting”

Can this be done as soon as possible?

Officer response:

Borough and District Councils are responsible for air quality monitoring and management. As such a number of Boroughs and Districts have installed signs similar to that suggested in areas where drivers might normally leave their engines idling – for example on approaches to level crossings. Were Epsom & Ewell to propose similar signs in the Borough, Surrey

County Council would be delighted to accommodate these on the Public Highway in suitable locations.

This page is intentionally left blank